

REMARKS

Initially, it is noted that the Examiner has objected to claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, the Examiner has questioned use of the phrase “adjustable portion” in claim 1. Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to overcome the Examiner’s rejection. As such, it is now believed that independent claim 1 is in proper form for allowance and withdrawal of the Examiner’s objection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 6-8, 19 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Christmas, U.S. Patent No. 1,921,561. In addition, the Examiner has rejected claims 2-4, 9-11, 20 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Christmas ‘561 patent in view Anson, U.S. Patent No. 2,731,056. Claims 5 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Christmas ‘561 patent in view of Pratt et al., U.S. Patent No. 710,073 and claims 12 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Christmas ‘561 patent in view of Ferencz, U.S. Patent No. 6,405,982. Finally, claims 13-16 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Christmas ‘561 patent in view of the Ferencz, ‘982 patent and further in view of the Anson ‘456 or the Pratt et al., ‘073 patent. As hereinafter described, applicant has amended the pending claims in order to more particularly define the invention for which protection is sought. Applicant now believes that the pending claims define over the cited references and reconsideration of the Examiner’s rejections is respectfully requested in view of the following comments.

Claim 1 defines a furniture glide for mounting a terminal end of a furniture leg having an outer surface. The furniture glide includes a base having a generally arcuate lower surface for engaging a supporting surface. A sleeve extends from the base along an axis and has an inner surface defining a cavity for receiving the furniture leg. A plurality of resilient projections extend radially inward from the upper edge of the sleeve for engaging the outer surface of the furniture leg and retaining the furniture leg in the cavity. The plurality of resilient projections space the furniture leg from the inner surface of the sleeve so as to allow the furniture leg to be supported within the cavity at an acute angle to the axis. As hereinafter described, nothing in the cited references shows or suggests the furniture guide that allows for the furniture leg to be supported within the glide at an acute angle to the longitudinal axis of the sleeve of such glide.

The Christmas '561 patent is directed to a cushion support that is mounted on the lower end of a leg. As best seen in Figs. 2 and 3 of the '561 patent, the cushion support includes a socket adapted for receiving the lower end of the furniture leg. It is noted, that the cushion support is formed from rubber so as to be snugly retained on the terminal end of the furniture leg. Hence, nothing in the '561 patent shows or suggests a plurality of resilient projections extending radially inward from the upper edge of the sleeve for engaging the outer surface of the furniture leg for retaining the furniture leg in the cavity of the sleeve, as required by independent claim 1. Further, unlike claim 1, a resilient projections do not space the furniture leg from the inner surface from the sleeve so as to allow the furniture leg to be supported within the cavity at an acute angle to the longitudinal axis of the sleeve. The deficiencies in the Christmas '561 patent cannot be rectified by any of the cited references.

The Anson '056 patent discloses a resilient casing adapted to accommodate a glass and to serve as a coaster therefore. The casing includes a body having a plurality of triangular wall portions that engage the outer surface of the glass. However, unlike the furniture glide in independent claim 1, the triangular wall sections do not project radially inward from the upper edge of the sleeve; do not space the glass from the inner surface of the sleeve; and do not allow

for the glass to be supported at an angle to the axis of the sleeve. Further, since the molded article disclosed in the '056 patent is specifically intended to accommodate a glass and to serve as a coaster therefore, it follows that the molded article is specifically designed not to support a glass at an acute angle to the axis of the sleeve. With respect to the door knob cover disclosed in the '056 patent, such a structure does not incorporate a sleeve extending from a base or a plurality of flexible projections extending into the cavity defined by the sleeve. Hence, it is believed that such reference is of minimum relevance to independent claim 1.

The Pratt et al., '073 patent is directed to an elastic tip for crutches, canes, chair legs and the like. The elastic tip includes a plurality of ridges along the inner surface thereof to maintain and to center the tip on an object. Nothing in the Pratt et al., '073 patent allows for the resilient projections to space the furniture leg from the inner surface of the sleeve so as to allow the furniture leg to be supported within the cavity at an acute angle to the axis of the sleeve. Such a structure is entirely absent from the tip disclosed in the '073 patent. Further, given that the tip of the '073 patent is intended for use as a tip for crutches, there is no suggestion in the reference to modify the structure of the tip to perform such function.

The Ferencz '982 patent merely discloses a self-attaching sliding support for an article of furniture. Nothing in the '982 patent shows or suggests a sleeve extending from a base of a furniture glide or a plurality of resilient projections extending radially inward from the upper edge of the sleeve. Further, nothing in the '982 patent suggests the resilient projections that space the furniture leg from the inner surface of the sleeve so as to allow the furniture leg to be supported within the cavity at an acute angle to the longitudinal axis of the sleeve. Such a structure is entirely absent from the '982 patent.

The furniture glide defined in independent claim 1 for a significant advantage over the structures disclosed in the cited references. More specifically, since the furniture glide of the present invention can support a furniture leg at an acute angle to the longitudinal axis of the

sleeve, the furniture glide is significantly more durable than the structures disclosed in the cited references. For example, as a portion of the base of the furniture glide begins to wear, the furniture glide may be rotated on the furniture leg such that a different portion of the base will engage the supporting surface on which the piece of furniture rests. As such, it can be appreciated that the furniture glide of the present invention has a longer useful life than the structures disclosed in the prior art.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that independent claim 1 clearly defines over the cited references and is in proper form for allowance. Claims 2 and 5-8 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and further define a furniture leg not shown or suggested in the prior art. It is believed that the claims 2 and 5-8 are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim and in view of the subject matter of each claim.

Referring to claim 12, a furniture glide is provided for mounting a terminal end of a furniture leg having an outer surface. The furniture glide includes a base and a sleeve extending along an axis from a base. The sleeve has an inner surface that defines a cavity for receiving the furniture leg. The sleeve includes a leg engagement element having a plurality of flexible projections extending into the cavity. The projections engage the furniture leg received in the cavity and space the furniture leg from the inner surface of the sleeve so as to allow the furniture leg to be supported within the cavity of the sleeve at an acute angle to the axis.

As heretofore described with respect to independent claim 1, none of the cited references (the Christmas '561 patent, the Anson '056 patent, the Pratt et al., '073 patent or the Ferencz '982 patent) show or suggest a furniture glide wherein a plurality of flexible projections extend into a cavity defined by a sleeve in order to space the furniture received in the cavity from the inner surface of the sleeve such that the furniture leg may be supported in the cavity of the sleeve at an acute angle to the axis of the sleeve. Consequently, it is believed that independent claim 12 defines over the cited reference and is in proper form for allowance.

Claims 14 and 16-17 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 12 and further define a furniture glide not shown or suggested in the art. It is believed that claims 14 and 16-17 are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim and in view of the subject matter of each claim.

Referring to claim 19, a furniture glide is provided for mounting on a terminal end of a furniture leg having an outer surface. The furniture glide includes a slider and a leg connection member interconnected thereto. The leg connection member includes a generally tubular sleeve extending along an axis and a plurality of flexible projections projecting from an inner surface thereof. The projections engage the furniture leg received in the cavity to space the furniture leg from the inner surface of the sleeve and to allow for the furniture leg to be supported within the cavity at an acute angle to the axis of the sleeve. As described with respect to claims 1 and 12, nothing in the cited references shows or suggests such a structure. Consequently, it is believed that independent claim 19 defines over the cited references and is in proper form for allowance. Claims 21-23 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 19 and further define a furniture glide not shown or suggested in the prior art. It is believed that claims 21-23 are allowable as dependent from an allowable base claim and in view of the subject matter of each claim.

RICHARD D. BUSHEY
Serial No.: 10/686,923
Page 11

Applicant believes that the present application with claims 1-2, 5, 7-8, 12, 14, 16-17, 19 and 21-23 is in proper form for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Director is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this or any other communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1170. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter C. Stomma, Registration No.36,020

Dated: 2/17/05
BOYLE, FREDRICKSON, NEWHOLM, STEIN & GRATZ, S.C.
250 Plaza, Suite 1030
250 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53202
Telephone: (414) 225-9755
Facsimile: (414) 225-9753
Docket No.: 286.043